

"T

Which

By :

"THE TEMPORALITIES FUND."

THE GREAT QUESTION ANSWERED!

Which Church is by Law, by Right, and common Honesty
entitled to the Temporalities?

By a SPECTATOR OF THE FIGHT, who has paid some attention
to the matter.

PRICE TWENTY CENTS.

MONTREAL, APRIL 14th,
1882.

DEAR

Canan
Canan
heter
Chur
show
Gene
its na
Chur
of Se
Scotl
contr
disgr
pale
fore,
proof
has n
Chur
conse
adva
have
in co
ackn
witne
from
is wh
the
the
toge

case
the
appe

"THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA."

DEAR READER,

What connection has the present "Presbyterian Church in Canada" with the Church of Scotland? Simply none whatever. The Canadian Church, under the specious pretence of a "Union" with a heterogeneous mass of incongruous sects, severed its connection with the Church of Scotland in 1875. And to mark their separation from, and to show their independence of, that Church, the United Church instituted a General Assembly of its own, and as if this was not enough, it changed its name to avoid the very appearance of having any connection with the Church of Scotland. Had they continued in connection with the Church of Scotland they could not have done this; nor could the Church of Scotland maintain a connection with a church over which she had no control; for in that case she would be liable to share in the shame and disgrace of any heresy or immoral scandal which might arise within her pale without having any power to remedy the evil. The mere fact, therefore, that the Canadian Church got up a General Assembly of its own is proof sufficient of its separation from the Mother Church, and that she has no more *connection* with the Church of Scotland than the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, or the Presbyterian Church of America; and that consequently she has no more claim to any emoluments or other advantages derivable from that Church than these above-named churches have. Nothing can be more clear than that the Non-Unionists are still in connection with the Church of Scotland, for they were, on all hands, acknowledged to be so previous to 1875, the Unionists themselves being witnesses; and they made no change then or since. But a secession from the Church of Scotland did then take place, and the question is which party seceded? It is evident that it was the party who made the change, *i. e.*, the Unionists, for had they made no change, they and the Non-Unionists would still have been one body working harmoniously together.

But to make still more patent if possible, let us imagine the following case. Suppose that the would-be heretic in Toronto had been deposed the other year for his heresy. What then? Would he, or could he have appealed to the Church of Scotland, for redress? We think not. Suppose

he had appealed to the General Assembly of that Church, and said, "I have been unjustly handled by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada;" they have loosed me from my charge, ousted me from my church, and deposed me from the office of the holy ministry, and in fact ruined me, and I want you to review their proceedings, reverse their judgment, and restore me to my quondam position." Well; would the Scottish Assembly have done so, or could they have done so? No; not they. But they might have said, if they had deigned to say anything at all: "Sir, we know you not, we have no connection with you, and we do not meddle with other people's matters; you have a General Assembly of your own, go to it, and seek justice where you lost it." And what would have been the effect of this conclusion? Why, simply that the appellant would have forfeited all claim to his interest in the Temporalities Fund, for the highest authority, the Church of Scotland itself, had declared that he had no connection with it, and this would have been enough. And had not the knowledge of this fact something to do with the hushing up of the case at Toronto at the time?

But suppose, on the other hand, that a similar thing had happened to a certain minister in Montreal, in a church of the same name; suppose his Synod had laid him on the shelf for promulgating erroneous doctrine, and that he had appealed to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and sought redress. Why, that Assembly would not only have taken up his case, but it would have been bound to do so; because he was one of their own ministers, had maintained his unbroken connection with them, and submission to them, and because that Assembly was his highest Court of Appeal. And had they reversed the Canadian Synod's finding, this would have entitled him to his former position, and maintained good his claim to the Temporalities Fund; thus showing the advantage of not following divisive courses either in doctrine, or in other changes.

But another proof of the separation of the Canadian Church from the Church of Scotland is the discordant nature of the elements composing the former; these elements comprise almost, if not all the various shades of Presbyterianism put together; but Freechurchmen and U. P's. vastly preponderating.

Now, is it likely that Freechurchmen and U. P's, whose brethren, and co-religionists in Scotland are, at this moment, moving heaven and earth, to ruin the Church of Scotland, can have any friendly connection with that Church? No; they cannot. They may say, and profess what they like, but the thing bears upon its front a manifest falsehood. Indeed,

we have
it was
with a
Scotlan
an ons

A
very ti
can no
can no
in brin
betrays
souls,
unseen
the cha
Rink t
minorit
from th
heavy
\$70,00
while i
funds
one pla
build
their h
a view
in Mo
allow
in the
when
secedi
church
he pro
speaki
Counc
Was it
bear h

W
and C
actors
about

we have never had but the *one* opinion of this Union business, viz., that it was got up in a spirit of hostility to the Church of Scotland; got up with a view to encourage a union of the Frees with the U. P's. in Scotland; and this union was sought in Scotland with the intent to have an onslaught upon the National Church.

And the agitation for such a union was going on in Scotland at the very time when the Canadian union was first propounded. In short, one can not be at all conversant with the origin and course of this union; one can not know all the outs and ins, and shifts and shims employed in bringing it about without deploring the human depravity which it betrays; and without seeing that the interests of religion, the salvation of souls, and the glory of God had nothing to do with the matter. Why the unseemly haste in pushing the Bills through the two Legislatures? Why the chase in leaving St. Paul's Church, and hurrying up to the Skating Rink to finish the job there? Why the cruel tyranny practised upon the minority who declined to join the Union party? Why extrude them from their churches, expel them from their manses, and involve them in heavy legal expenses in defending their own rights? Why expend \$70,000 to bribe Christianity to grow and flourish in one "Union" spot, while it was crippled and crushed in another Non-Union spot for want of funds? Is this the way to spread the religion of Jesus, to banish it from *one* place to *another*? Why not give \$70,000 to the Non-Unionists to build churches in the room of those which were *unjustly* wrested from their honest possession? Why the quirks and quibbles resorted to with a view to defeat the ends of justice while the law-suits were pending in Montreal? Why the exorbitant security demanded from Mr. Dobie to allow him to carry on his case? Why did some of the Union witnesses in the Court, say *one* thing when they spoke the truth, and the *tother* thing when they spoke *popularly*? What about the dodge of Mr. Dobie seceding from the United Church; or how could a man secede from a church in which he never had his foot, and against whose very existence he protested with might and main? Those who said so must have been speaking *popularly*. Why did the Unionists oppose an appeal to the Privy Council as if they wished to deprive the minority of all chance of justice? Was it not because they knew that their cause was rotten and would not bear honest inspection?

What an amount of low fox-cunning, and what a deficiency of moral and Christian principle do these questions suggest? And yet the actors in this drama have the effrontery to hold up their faces and to talk about "*honour*" and "*honour* bright;" well, it is said that there is

honour among thieves, and perhaps the honour among the *fures* may soon be as bright as the honour at Toronto !

This whole Union business has been clumsily managed, amazingly ill-cooked, although the chief cook at the job, has been a Cook all his days.

Had they been really anxious to form an honest and Godly Union, such as would have been an honour to religion, and a blessing to themselves, they should have left all behind them ; churches, manses, glebes and cash, and started anew on their own hook, as the Free Church clergy of Scotland did in 1843. This would have shown that they were honest, in earnest, and that they were acting for God's glory and the people's good ; and it would have put it out of the power of any one to say that they were selfish, and that their union was created for the purposes of robbery and plunder. But to act as they did was sure to rouse the worst feelings of the human heart, and to be productive of more evil than good, by engendering enmity and ill-will between man and man, and family and family. Who ever heard, in a free and civilized country, of *one* religious body being *compelled* either to join another, or to suffer the loss of their cash and property. Suppose that the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, had, in 1875, decided, by a majority, to join the Roman Catholic Communion ; what then ? Would the minority (likely a large one) have been compelled to follow suit, or to lose their property and emoluments ? Or what would be thought of the Roman Catholics of Montreal, who are vastly in the majority, should they attempt to coerce their fellow-Protestants, either to adopt their *true* faith, or in default to suffer the loss of all their Ecclesiastical plant and pecuniary means ? And if they did so, when would we hear the end of Protestant cries about popish tyranny, and yet Protestants can do the same thing to one another when it suits their purpose ?

Religion is a thing which has mainly and chiefly to do with the heart, but the heart can not be constrained by majorities, or Acts of Parliament, to embrace this or that creed, or to love this or that sect, and the mere attempt to make it do so betrays an ignorance of human nature, or a want of common honesty utterly reprehensible. You might as well attempt to control the winds of heaven and waves of the ocean by majorities or Acts of Parliament ; and yet it must be confessed that it has become very much the fashion in this day to settle everything by the vote. Just as children put everything they can clutch to the mouth, so do Parliaments and public meetings nowadays put everything to the

vote,
voting
would
reason
argum
for th
with t
is no
hasty,
for re

P
the Se
doubt
It wa
passed
we no
came
judicie
men a
moved
should
by all

B
briefly
V
is not
it mai
follow

F
sworn
mothe
clamo
fore, h

S
1844,
their i
ship w
1875 ;
sympa

vote, and hence our Parliament halls are fast dwindling down to mere voting shops, where to hear an eloquent speech, or an able argument, would be something akin to a miracle. But it is easy to guess the reasons for this. It saves the trouble of listening to speeches, weighing arguments, balancing statements, and of reasoning out just conclusions for themselves ; and it consults their ease and indolence, and dispenses with the need of brains and education, for any one can vote. But there is no doubt that this is the reason why there are so many raw, crude, hasty, ill-made laws in Canada, and so many appeals to the Privy Council for redress from their injurious effects.

But bad as things are, they might be infinitely worse were it not for the Senate ; for the very knowledge of the existence of that Chamber, no doubt, exercises a wholesome check upon wild and thoughtless legislation. It was a Mob-Rule Parliament, or a Parliament without a Senate, that passed the ill-starred Bills of the Presbyterian Church in 1875. And had we no Senate things might go on helter-skelter from bad to worse till they came to utter ruin. So that a Senate, filled with honourable and judicious gentlemen, having the good of the country at heart, with gentlemen above bribery and corruption, and with gentlemen who will not be moved by vulgar clamour, or carried away by every new-fangled project, should be esteemed as a priceless blessing, and honoured and supported by all honest men.

But this is a digression, and we must now return to the subject, and briefly recapitulate what we have already said.

We say, then, that the present "Presbyterian Church in Canada" is not only *not* in connection with the Church of Scotland, but that it maintains a secret hostility towards it ; and this will be seen from the following facts :—

First.—Because it contains members (U. P's.) who are born and sworn enemies to that Church, who have sucked in enmity to it with their mother's milk, and whose brethren in Scotland are at this moment clamouring for the disestablishment of said Church, and they must, therefore, be averse to it.

Secondly.—Because it contains members (Free Churchmen) who, in 1844, severed their connection with that Church, and thereby sacrificed their interest in the Temporalities Fund rather than continue their fellowship with it, and it is not likely that they were to return to its bosom in 1875 ; but it is likely and natural to think that they will side and sympathize with their co-religionists in Scotland who are also labouring

at present for the disestablishment of the Church of Scotland, and are, therefore, natural enemies to it. And if they are honest men, they can have no sympathy with those who are now appealing from the late judgment of the Privy Council !

Thirdly.—Because a clerical would be leader, and would be representative of the United Church, in Montreal, went to Scotland, since the Union, to collect money for some religious purpose, and solicited subscriptions right and left from the clergy of the Church of Scotland, and came home to Canada fattened with their hospitality and loaded with their cash, and then turned round and preached up the doctrine that *all* churches should be *disestablished*.—*Vide* the *Montreal Daily Witness* for August 3rd, 1878. Could such a man be in connection with the Church of Scotland, and could he be a friend to her ?

Fourthly.—Because the Canadian Church instituted a General Assembly of its own to show its separation from, and its independence of, the Church of Scotland, and must, therefore, cherish unfriendly feelings towards it.

Fifthly.—Because the Canadian Church changed its name as if to avoid all appearance of any connection with the Church of Scotland, as if to cast out her name as an unclean thing, and to smooth the way for dissenters to join the Union Church.

Sixthly.—Because it was a well-known fact that the chief leader, or leaders of the movement for Union entertained a secret aversion to the Church of Scotland, and would have left her fold in 1843-44 had it not been that they saw no way of carrying off the Temporalities Fund with them, because Dr. Mathieson, of St. Andrew's Church, Montreal, then stood in the way ; but whenever they got his head underneath the green sod, then they got out their horns, and commenced their secret conclaves for union, and kept constantly cooking at it until it was ready for serving up, and hence the United Church—and a pretty conglomeration of raw materials it is.

And Seventhly.—Because provision was made by the United Church for the extinction of the Temporalities Fund on the death of the present Commuters ; *i. e.*, that those clergymen who might hold the same principles with the minority (their connection with the Church of Scotland), and fill the same pulpits vacated on the decease of the minority, should derive no income or benefit from the Temporalities Fund ; that is, should receive no share of their *own* money, because they continued faithful to the pledges that were given, and the sanctions that were made

d, and are,
n, they can
late judg-

d be repre-
l, since the
d solicited
f Scotland,
oaded with
ne that *all*
Witnes
n with the

a General
endence of,
dly feelings
me as if to
Scotland, as
h the way

f leader, or
sion to the
had it not
ities Fund
, Montreal,
erneath the
their secret
was ready
onglomera-

ted Church
the present
the same
Church of
f the mino-
iti Fund ;
y continued
were made

in 1858. How honest ! And last but not least, the fact that they went, in 1875, to two Canadian Legislatures, and sought, got laws made to transfer the Temporalities Fund, and the church property from their then honest and legal owners, to the new-fangled church, is the clearest possible proof that they then cut all connection with the Church of Scotland ; for had they been still in connection with it, they did not require any new laws, nor was there any need that the cash and property should change hands, for those who had the control of them were ever ready to use them, and employ them for the benefit of all who had a claim upon them.

But to see through the cunning and craft of the whole business, you had only to ask a Union clergyman, if, when drawing his Temporalities cash, he had to make any declaration, at the Bank, to the effect that he was still in connection with the Church of Scotland, and he would boldly answer, No ; that he made no statement of any kind, that he simply handed in his cheque for so much, received his money, and withdrew. And this was quite true, true to the letter ; he did not say anything, nor did he need to say anything, for the cheque said it all for him. He had only to sign a cheque of which the following is a copy :—

No.....

The Temporalities' Board of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland.

Montreal.....187

To the Cashier of the Merchants Bank of Canada

Pay toor order,

.....Dollars.

\$.....Chairman.

.....Secretary.

Now, it is easy to see from the above that the Holy man had no need to tell a *lie* by *vive voce*, for the dumb paper, which made him responsible for all that it said and contained, told it for him, and he only signed the printed document. Was there ever a piece of more glaring, hypocritical deception, of more corrupt thimblerrigging, and of more sneaking, selfish sophistry ? Surely, never ; the man who cannot live without doing these things, does not deserve to live ; he is an eyesore to

God's fair creation. Is it any wonder that the Pulpit should be on the wane, when its occupants do deeds at which the humblest labourer would blush?

During the course of the lawsuits in Montreal, a witness, on the Union side, was asked why they used such cheques as the one above referred to, he replied that they had a large stock of them on hand when the union was accomplished, and that they thought it a pity to lose them, and that there was no harm in using them. But is it likely that gentlemen, who were profusely scattering the Temporalities dollars like snow-flakes all around, were to use such a parsimonious economy in a trifling affair like this? Or is it not more presumable that they had anticipated being called upon to give in an account of their stewardship, and that they had provided themselves with a large supply in order to furnish themselves with an excuse for their conduct? This is more in keeping with their general dealings; and how low the cunning!

These gentlemen have the assurance, in the presence of these facts, to hold up their faces and say: "We are in connection with the Church of Scotland." Was ever the East further from the West than this is from truth and honesty? Never. And why do they say so? Why, but for the meanest and lowest of all reasons, viz., to furnish themselves with an excuse or a pretext for drawing so many dollars a year from the Temporalities Fund. Was there ever anything more like a swindle or a pious fraud? Suppose that any of these gentlemen were brought into court for obtaining money upon false pretences, what could they say for themselves? They could prove their right to the money only by proving their connection with the Church of Scotland, and how could they prove this? They could say it, but this would be a mere assertion without proof.

The Church of Scotland (in Scotland) could not admit such a connection, and the Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, would repudiate them as renegades. And what then? It would be for the judge to say the rest; but they could not be surprised should he hand them over to the hospitality of one of Her Majesty's hotels, where they would get free lodgings, and live at heck and manger, and have nothing to do but learn the short lesson that "Honesty is the best policy."

But is there no way out of this mess, this farrago of conflicting feelings, interests and rights? Or is it only a determination on each side to get the mastery and gain the triumph? Who commenced this holy war? It was the Unionists, for the Non-Unionists sought no change,

and made no change, and yet it is proposed to regard them as dissenters ; but we have already shown the absurdity of this ; that a man cannot be a dissenter from a church of which he was never a member, and against whose very existence he loudly protested, or if he is compelled, *volens volens*, to be a dissenter, why punish him by the loss of his cash and property for being what he could not help being ? Their Lordships in London saw through this dodge at a glance, and declined to listen to it. Suppose a man, in full communion with a certain church, leaves Canada for six or twelve months, to see his friends in the old country, and returns and finds himself a dissenter from his church and denomination, and his property threatened with confiscation in case of refusal to comply ! How blue he would look to think that this should be done in a country which boasts of its freedom and liberty ! It used to be the law and the rule in all well regulated States to punish for mischief the party that originated the mischief, and this was clearly what the Privy Council intended in the Dobie case by ordaining the Unionists to return to the old law of 1858, and pay the costs of the suit. But if the Dominion Parliament is to step in and make laws to nullify, or reverse the judgments of the Privy Council, then there will be no use in appealing to that august Tribunal in future. And would not such a state of things be tantamount to a declaration of Independence ? This is a matter in which not only religious communities, but the whole country is deeply interested. Business men may have law-suits in which vast interests and heavy sums of money may be involved ; they appeal to the Privy Council, and get a decision in their favour, but the Dominion Parliament meets, sets their Lordships' judgment at defiance, robs the just of their rights, and thereby panders to unprincipled majorities. Majorityism in Canada seems to us to be only a disguised name for Communism or Socialism ; the principle involved in it is amazingly akin ; and that principle is that the *majority* should rob the minority ; that the strong should plunder the weak, and that all should give way to selfish, greedy votes ! Now, it is a well-known fact that rich people are always in the minority, that the educated classes are always in the minority, and that God's chosen people in the churches are always in the minority ; and are they all, and always bad, vile and wretched people, who ought to be trodden under foot by unruly mobs, and tyrannized over by unscrupulous majorities ? There was only *one* Noah amongst all the wicked millions of the anti-diluvian world ; only *one* Lot amongst all the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah ; and only *one* Jesus in the world since the world began ; these were all in the minority, amazingly in the minority, and yet they were all in the right, and were all as dear to God as the apple of His eye ; but had they lived

in Canada in our day, they might have been sneered at and despised for not being in the *majority*, and would have had the chance of being branded as a "wretched minority." Now majorities are like many other things in this world, all good enough in their own place, but then they should be kept there. Majorities may be absolutely necessary to settle matters of mere opinion, because one man's mind upon a given subject may be as good as another's. But where moral and religious principles are at stake, where the property and the vested rights of others are at stake, and where facts and figures with known and fixed values are at stake, then votes and majorities are utterly inadmissible; and those who attempt to bring them into such matters lay themselves open to the charge of dishonesty and tyranny.

What would be thought of a company of creditors who should meet together, and vote, for their own avarice, that 2 and 2 make 50, and then insist that every debtor they had should pay them \$50 instead of \$4? Now, the creditors might say this from a selfish motive, not because it was true, but because it put money in their pockets; and so it is by a like *crooked, squint* logic of this kind that the Unionists say that they are in connection with the Church of Scotland; and they say it not because it is true, but because it puts ill-gotten cash into their pockets. If they be in connection with the Church of Scotland, then this fact must be capable of proof; and if it be capable of proof why not prove it? Why not "produce their cause," bring forth their "strong reasons," and justify themselves before the world? For they never had more need to do so, for assuredly they do not look very *bonnie* in the eyes of honest men at this moment. They have never yet said anything for themselves, but, as the Scotch say, *deaved* the country with dishonest clamour about "Overwhelming majorities;" but overwhelming majorities cannot make wrong right, or evil good, or robbery honest. A band of burglars may plunder a dry goods store, and then turn round and say to the robbed merchant, "O, we are in the majority, you are only *one*, but we are a score, and therefore it is all right! If this majority doctrine be allowed to rule, then no man's property can be safe.

But again, has any Parliament, Court, or class of men a right to choose out for me what I shall believe? What denomination of Christians I must join? or what church I shall attend? Has any one the right to say to me: "Sir, you must go to yon church at the cross roads; and you must contribute of your means to the minister's support; you will also be called upon, from time to time, to advance money to keep the church and manse in repair, and once more to give your periodical mite to the various religious schemes of the church." I ask what sort of people they

are w
heave
mixty
wors
whos
own
at a
love
power
but it
it, or
Really
count
says
then
major
its fa
suit?
major
too?
speak
gate,
which
Clear
Well,
becau
major
comf
all th
it; f
claim
they
throu
arran
spl
but t
ties
have
have
than
to th
to m

are who worship in that church? And the answer is: "O, good heavens! don't ask me that, for I don't know, but I think they are a *mixty maxty* of all sorts!" "Well," I reply, "I am not going there to worship with people whose religious principles I do not know, or whose religious principles I might ignore or abhor; I shall stick by my own church, and my own co-religionists. Think of me sitting side by side at a Communion table with people whom I am expected and urged to love when I do not. Would not this be hypocrisy? And is there any power on earth which can compel me to be a hypocrite?" "Well, sir, but it is even so; for it is the will of the majority, and you must either do it, or we shall confiscate your property, and seize upon your cash-box! Really? How beautiful in this nineteenth century, and in this free country. And this is religious liberty!" "Well, J. L. M. says so; he says that the majority has power to control the minority!" "And must then the faith of the minority be always the same as the faith of the majority?" "I fancy so;" then if the majority should choose to change its faith once a year, or any number of times, must the minority follow suit? I believe so! Pretty orthodox doctrine! But yet again, if the majority should please to go to the bottomless pit, must the minority go too? Oh, no. The Scriptures do not countenance that view; they speak only of the majority going there! For they say: "Wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat." And you think that this refers to the majority? Clearly! And do you think that the majority ought to be sent there? Well, that is the old way of doing things! The rich man was sent there because he had received all his good things in this life; and if the majority get all the Temporalities Fund they will be well qualified for comfortable quarters below stairs! But do you think that they will get *all* this large sum of money to do as they like with it? No, not a cent of it; for there is not a cent of theirs for they have, by their acts, forfeited all claim to it. The money clearly belongs to the minority, and if they get it they will make a better use of it, and not spend it in sending raw loons through the country in the summer months sputtering and spreading their arrant nonsense, and doing more harm than good, and then talking of 'splendid success.'" But this "splendid success" is not due to Union, but to the \$70,000 which they dishonestly abstracted from the Temporalities Fund. It is a well-known fact, and a fact of which Unionists themselves have complained, that many congregations, especially in country districts, have contributed far less money for religious purposes since the Union than before. Such congregations sat down, took their ease, and trusted to the large collections and wealthy congregations in the towns and cities to make up their deficiencies. And thus the Union, so far from doing

good, has relieved the people of their self-reliance, and encouraged them to maintain a cold and selfish indifference. So that instead of calling the "Union" a "splendid success," it would be more correct to call it a splendid humbug. Nor is it easy to believe that the "Union" was ever intended for the benefit of Christianity, but as a ruse to get hold of the Temporalities Fund, and to ruin the interests of the Church of Scotland in Canada.

Then the question arises should the Non-Unionists make any compromise with the other side? And we answer decidedly, "none whatever." Should they attempt to do this, they will run great risk in creating a split in their own camp, which is much to be guarded against. The fund, and the whole fund, clearly belongs to the Non-Unionists, and no power on earth can deprive them of it without grossly disgracing themselves. And should they do so, let the Non Unionists bear in mind, that they have still truth and justice on their side, and still a Privy Council to go to, and that they are fighting for a principle which is far more precious than the whole "Fund" at stake. And they cannot appeal to England a second time without showing to the world how justice and honesty were burked and butchered in the voting shops of Canada.

But let us, in closing, give a specimen of the manner in which many congregations were used by the Unionists. We have one congregation in particular in our eye which will serve as a sample of many others.

On a given night a meeting is held in the church about union; it is the first of its kind. But it is found that union is against the grain, that the feeling of the meeting is unfavourable to it, and that union will not go down. But the minister takes out his pocket-handkerchief, wipes his mouth, makes a fuss, and then a palaver about it being a very important step; that they would better think seriously over it until such an evening when they would meet again. This is a shift to gain time, and he sedulously employs the interval in canvassing the people to vote for union. The time of meeting arrives, and forty or fifty people, out of a congregation of 500, put in an appearance; but it is again seen that there is a majority against union, that union is in fact a distasteful, uphill job. The minister, however, is not to be done; he again employs his handkerchief, makes another fuss, and another palaver, and says: "It has just occurred to me that this is not a legal meeting, there has not been sufficient time between the notice and the meeting, there should have been ten days, but I see there have only been nine." Another dodge to see what would turn up in the chapter of accidents; and in the meantime his Reverence is again busy canvassing the flock from house to house.

The s
found
congre
just b
they
church
congre
them,
silly g
minist
who c
to gre
them
tion o

V
more
dishor
they
seek
holy o
Scotla
broil
world
gentry
princi
tenan

C
first w
the Q

T
fair d
of wh
be de
has v
past s
going
disgra
ing th
truth
their

The set time for the next meeting comes, and some thirty people are found present ; they vote, 16 for union, and 15 against. And the congregation are told, next Sabbath, from the pulpit that the Union has just been consummated, and the minority are virtually informed, that if they do not choose to fall in with the majority, they can go and build a church for themselves, and employ a minister at their own expense ! The congregation come out enraged at the advantage which has been taken of them, and find, upon inquiry, that the casting vote was given by a silly girl. And here the malcontents are without a church, and without a minister ; for they scorn to have anything to do with a minister who could use them so. They are exasperated in their feelings, are put to great inconvenience and much expense ; and yet the Unionists tell them that this is the way to make Christianity flourish ! The formation of such a Union would have done credit to a *Cæsar Borgia*.

We verily think that the clergy will utterly ruin religion ; they do far more harm to it by their bickering and battling, and barefaced selfish dishonesty, than all the atheists and infidels that ever lived. And, unless they behave better, the time cannot be far distant, when society must seek some legal protection against the eternal annoyance of these holy disturbers of the public peace. At this moment England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, Italy, France and Canada, are kept in a constant broil by men who claim to be the salt of the earth, and the light of the world. France, we think, takes the "short and easy method" with such gentry ; she packs them to the door bag and baggage, and acts upon the principle of the Scotch proverb : "That better a toom hoose than a bad tenant."

One of the things of which the Non-Unionists loudly complained at first was the unprincipled haste with which the Bills were pushed through the Quebec and Ontario Parliaments.

This was presumptive evidence that there was a want of honesty and fair dealing on the part of the promoters, that they had something to hide of which they were ashamed, and that they were afraid lest they should be detected ere their evil designs were accomplished ! And the result has verified their fears. And yet in the face of this fact, and with the past seven years' experience before them, the Dominion Parliament are going to work with a haste tenfold greater, with a haste so shameful and disgraceful that it is a marvel to all honest men. They are even suspending the very forms of the House, and hurrying on regardless of all reason, truth and justice, in order to rob a respectable body of Christians of their ecclesiastical funds, and church property. They are afraid to give

the country time to see what they are about, lest they should be found out at their scandalous work—work which will likely have to be reviewed by the Privy Council in England. There is nothing to hinder them to wait until June, when the General Assembly of the one Church, and the Synod of the other, meet, and when the clergy of both churches will discuss the matter, and give their views of it, which ought to be listened to, as they are more deeply interested in it than any other class of men. And if the promoters of the Bills, at Ottawa, have no sinister, selfish ends to serve, why not give ample time, and every possible opportunity to both sides to see all the bearings of their respective measures? But if the M. P's. of the House are to take political capital out of the matter, then the minority have no more chance to get justice than they have to catch living whales in a marble quarry. The Unionists do not go to Parliament in the attitude of *honest* men, but they go in the shape of Majorityites, saying: "We are in the majority, and we want you to rob that minority, and give us their cash and property, and we will vote for you at the hustings; you vote for us now, and we will vote for you then, its a *quid pro quo*." A voice: "But there is no honesty *there*." A Union voice: "Ho, never mind honesty; we have no use for it; it is not a plank in our platform. Majorityism is our motto." A voice: "And that means Communism, and Communism means robbery and plunder." A Union voice: "We are in the voting shop, go on, vote away, and never mind the rights of property!"

But we asked above, is there any way out of this difficulty, for we cannot remain in this mess? We answer, certainly; there are to the Unionists two honest exits out of it. The one of which we have already hinted at; and that is, either they should depart in peace, taking nothing with them of other people's, as the Free Church clergy of Scotland did in 1843; or that they should retrace their steps, return to their first love, and acknowledge their error, as the prodigal son did eighteen hundred years ago, and for which wise deed he has been praised all these years; but if not, we leave them to do worse.

In glancing over the *Star*, of March 22, 1882, we observed a letter signed "Episcopalian," in which it was kindly advised that the Temporalities Fund should be proportionally divided between the two claimants.

Now, let us see how this would work in actual practice. Suppose that Episcopalian is going home in a murky night with half-a-million dollars on him; that nineteen honest men, each nearly as honest as any one of the leading members of "The Presbyterian Church in Canada," *forgathered* with him in a lonely spot, and robbed of his last dollar;

and suppose that he knew them all, that he instituted legal proceedings against them to recover his cash. How would he look should the Court propose to divide the funds proportionally between them, that is, that Episcopalian should recover one-twentieth part of his own money, and that each of the others should also receive a twentieth part to encourage them to rob some other millionaire ! How beautiful the morality !

No, no. The Minority must make no compromise ; for the whole money is theirs. The cash belongs to those only who are in connection with the Church of Scotland ; the Minority are so, and the Majority are not so, and if the Minority had their *own* funds they would soon have a flourishing church. But they may say with the Psalmist : " The bands of the wicked have robbed me."

SPECTATOR.

April 14, 1882.

P.S.—We should have noticed that there is far less union in the country now than there was previous to 1875, for the congregations which stood aloof from each other then, practically stand aloof from each other still ; and then there are all the Non-Unionists to the bargain.

SPECTATOR.



APPENDIX.

We have now before us the closing *part* of the Privy Council judgment in the Temporalities suit, as given by the *Globe* (Toronto) of February 22, 1882. It is as follows :—

“ Their (Lordships) decision depends upon the answer to be given to the question which church or aggregate of churches is now to be considered as being, or representing, the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland within the meaning of the Act 22 Vic., cap. 66. But the two churches which appear from the record to have rival claims to that position are not represented in this action, and of the six ministers whose pecuniary interests are assailed by the appellant, he has only called one, the Rev. Dr. Cook, as a respondent. That question between the churches must be determined somehow before a constitutional board can be selected, and unless the Dominion Parliament intervenes there will be ample opportunity for new and protracted litigation. It cannot be determined now because the appellant has not asked any order from the Court in regard to the formation of the new board, and has not made the individuals and religious bodies interested parties to this cause. Substantial success being with the appellant, he must have his costs as against the respondent, but their Lordships are of opinion that neither the respondents' own costs, nor those in which they are found liable to the appellant, ought to come out of the Trust Fund which they are holding, and administering without legal title.” The appellant's costs must, therefore, be paid by the members of the respondents' corporation as individuals. Their Lordships will accordingly humbly advise Her Majesty that the judgments under appeal ought to be reversed and that the cause should be remitted to the Court of Queen's Bench of Lower Canada, with directions to that Court to give effect to the declarations recommended by this Board, and also to issue, in the appellant's favour, an injunction and decree for costs as directed by this Board.”

From the above *decision* it is evident that their Lordships did not mean that the Dominion Parliament should do anything more than find

out
conn
their
very
to e
chur
only
conn
mad
Noth
their
ceed
has a
whos
truth
ties.
upon
lead
mino
prin
are h
justi
Priv
their
the K
so ma
all p
cash
He h
King
if he
comp
Mar
by as
of ad
answ
prov
to th
from
as th
decl
only

out and determine which church was 'entitled to be regarded as in connection with the Church of Scotland, and that, when it had done that, their Lordships' judgment would step in and do all the rest. This was a very simple duty the Dominion Parliament had to do ; it had only to examine the Act 22 Vic., cap. 66, and to take evidence as to which church came within the meaning of that Act ; or more easy still, it had only to say that the minority were, on all hands, acknowledged to be in connection with the Church of Scotland previous to 1875, and as they made no change then, nor since, they must be in connection with it still. Nothing can be more plain and honest. But instead of this they allow their eyes to be blinded with dirt and dust from Kingston, and then proceed to haul into the subject a vast quantity of extraneous matter which has actually turned the judgment of the Privy Council against the side in whose favour it was given. And all this has been in the teeth of reason, truth, justice and honesty, and by vulgar brute votes, and brute majorities. No wonder that the public prints teem with scathing reflections upon the defective honesty and the want of moral principle among the leading public men of Canada ; fie, for shame upon them ! But let the minority stand true to themselves, and true to their moral and religious principles, and they cannot fail to gain one point, viz., to show that they are honest men, and not low, dishonest rogues. They have truth and justice on their side, a good conscience within their bosoms, and the Privy Council still to appeal to ; and the other side can plead nothing in their behalf but the brute votes of unprincipled majorities. What right has the Kingston Corypheus to come forward to any Parliament, and lay down so many principles, and then virtually say : " It is my will and pleasure that all people should act up to these my principles, or suffer the loss of their cash and property ? " Who gave him this mighty power and authority ? He has been very much inclined to play the monkey ever since he got Kingston, and to push himself forward to the front wherever he goes, as if he believed that all classes would count it an honour to be seen in his company. We don't covet the honour. In his speech, at Ottawa, March 16th, 1882, this great man is alleged to have laid down a principle by asking the following question : " Is there, or is there not, any freedom of action, any possible way for one church to unite with another ? " We answer, most certainly there is ; but under this proviso, and under this proviso only, that if the two churches (the buildings) belong exclusively to the two uniting congregations, there is nothing earthly to hinder them from uniting together, and from making such laws, rules and regulations, as they please ; but if there be but one *single* member in each church who declines to join the *union*, then the intending *Unionists* can form a *union*, *only* by leaving the two churches (the two buildings) behind them, and

by building two other churches elsewhere for themselves. The justice of this is obvious ; for it is clear that a portion of each church, however small, was, and is, the property of each recusant, and that no *majority*, however great or overwhelming, has the right or the power to rob a man of his just possession, or if they had, what man's property would be safe ? In such a case there is not a duke, or a lord, in England, but who would be liable to be voted out of his broad lands and princely dwellings any day by brute majorities. The principle is exceedingly dangerous, and extremely *dishonest* ! And yet it is here where all the evil lies in this union business, and from which have sprung all the fighting, and heart-burnings, and law-suits, and waste of money, and damage to religion, and discredit to the clergy ; and if the Kingston Corypheus has not the discernment to see this, it says very little for his mental penetration ; and if he has seen it, and still acts in the face of such knowledge, it says very little for his moral character. And it is amazing that such a corrupt fallacy should have escaped the notice of all the Business Committees in Ottawa. What are the people of Canada to think of the mental capacity of their public men ?

Corypheus next says : " Every one would admit that the Presbyterians in Canada had a right to unite, if any two churches had, since they were one in doctrine, race, modes of church government, and spiritual and national ancestry." To be sure every one would admit this ; nobody denied their right to unite if they were all pleased and agreeable among themselves. But what was denied, stoutly denied, and will be denied to the end of the chapter, was that they had a right to confiscate the church property, and to seize upon the cash-box of others ; that we denied, and still deny.

Had the Kingston Corypheus and his following left the church with which they were connected taking nothing with them, then nobody could have said a word against them ; perhaps many might have admired them for their self-sacrifice. But to go to Parliament and substantially say : " Gentlemen, please rob yon Non-Unionists of their churches and cash, and give them to us ; for we are so fond of them that since we cannot get ourselves, we would like to get all that they possess ! What a beautiful Union, how loving, how Christian, and how kind, and all made by Acts of Parliament, and physical force ; by Acts of Parliament which were " fought against in Quebec and Toronto." Oh, how loving ! But the Very Rev. Principal yet says : " The Mother Church in Scotland had also been consulted and favoured it." Now, we ask was it fair, was it honest, in a man of the Corypheus' position, and on such an important occasion as this to use such vague and indefinite language ? Did the gentlemen

before whom he spoke not deserve anything better? and was the gravity of the subject in hand not worthy of anything better?

Why did he not state to the Committee *when* the Church of Scotland was consulted? *Where* she was consulted? And *how* she was consulted? If by written communication, what did the communication say? If by deputation, who composed the deputation, and what were they empowered to say or do? And if the General Assembly of the Scottish Church "favoured" the Canadian Union, how did she express that favour? Was it only by *viva voce*? Or was it by a written official deliverance? And if by the latter, why did Corypheus not procure a copy of said deliverance, and read it, and show it to the Committee. This would have shown to the Committee, and the country, whether he was speaking the truth, or whether he was speaking only *popularly*! For the Non-Unionists have all along strongly suspected the honesty and truthfulness of the Unionists, and given them credit for deceit, double dealing, and low fox-cunning. But why consult the Church of Scotland at all upon the point? She could neither help them to, nor hinder them from, union. All she could say in the matter would likely be this: "When you leave me, see that you take nothing with you but your own; don't run away with my churches, manses and cash," as any kind mother would say to a prodigal son who was about to leave home to waste his Temporalities upon riotous living—\$70,000 at a *spree*.

The Very Rev. Corypheus once more says: "140 out of 150 congregations had asked for the Union." Now, suppose that each of these ten reclaiming congregations contained 50 members; here were 500 people who were denied the privilege of religious liberty; and if 500 could be denied this blessing, why may not 5,000, or 5,000,000, or a whole country's inhabitants. And if so, where would be religious liberty? Nowhere, how beautiful!

It is this last fact that lends such an unspeakable interest to the matters now in dispute at Ottawa. Religious liberty is of infinitely greater value than the Temporalities Fund itself. And hence the impropriety of making any compromise with a class of men who would strike a blow at the root of such a priceless blessing; it is tantamount to offering them so many thousand dollars as a reward for their base conduct. Therefore the duty of the minority is plain and clear, viz., to take the matter once more to the Privy Council if need be, where reason and facts, truth and justice, and honour and honesty will be the guiding lights in their decision, and where unprincipled majorities, and thoughtless brute votes, given at hap-hazard, will be held in disdain.

One word upon the Principal's second principle, which he puts by

asking this question : " Did we go the right way about getting that Union ? " To this we answer, decidedly no ; you did not. You had no right to go to *any* Parliament and ask the aid of the State sword to compel one class of men to love another, or suffer the loss of their means and substance. This was a tyranny which might have done credit to Spain in the darkest days of the Inquisition. You cannot make Christian unions by big majorities, or brute votes, or Acts of Parliament, or by force of any kind ; whenever force comes in, love goes out, and union ceases ; and the Principal of a College should have known this. Christian unions can be made only by Christian love, Christian kindness, Christian charity and forbearance, and by allowing every man to keep hold of his own.

But Principal Grant yet talks as if there were only *two* churches in the Union. He says : " Every one would admit that the Presbyterians in Canada had a right to unite, if any *two* churches had. This is another instance of that popular language which the Unionists have used so freely to disguise things, and to make them look other and better than they are. He would hereby seem to insinuate that the Old Church need not object so much to the Union, since they were asked to admit only *one* denomination more into their company. Now, is this the case ? Is it true that the Union Church received only *one* more denomination into its bosom in 1875 ? Let us see ;* they admitted the " Free Church," the " U. P. Church," the " Reformed Presbyterians," and the " Original Seceders," if not more ; all sects cherishing a secret, deep-rooted antipathy to the Old Church, as their brethren, in Scotland, evince at this day by their cries for dis-establishment ; fine companions for gentlemen who wish to uphold the Throne, and the time-honoured Institutions of the Land !

* There are, at present, no less than six different shades of Presbyterians in Glasgow (Scotland) alone, viz. : the Church of Scotland, the Free Church of Scotland, the United Presbyterian Church, the Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Original Secession, and the Free Presbyterian Church. (See *Glasgow Weekly Herald*, of January 21st, 1882, page 5.) Here, then, are all the elements which, according to Kingston logic, are necessary to form a united church ; they are not only as much " one in doctrine, race, modes of church Government, and spiritual and national ancestry," as are the Presbyterians in Canada, but they are born in the same city, dwell in the same street, and live next door to each other, and yet no power on earth, external to themselves, could make them unite. But perhaps their safety consists chiefly in the absence of two things. First, they have no Temporalities Fund to be a temptation to *dishonest saints* ; for there can be no question that this fund formed, and still forms, the grand bond of union in the United Church in Canada ; had there been no Temporalities Fund, there would have been no union. It was the dollars they loved, and not the Deity, or the souls of men ! And by getting hold of this fund they were enabled to

Next, the Very Rev. Principal says: "No one would deny that the Union was for the benefit of the people concerned." We answer, that we hold that the Union was devised, brought on and completed, out of a spirit of enmity to the old church; to encourage the consummation of a proposed union between the Free and the U. P. Churches in Scotland at that time; it was to enable the promoters of union there to turn round and say, "oh, see what they are doing away in Canada; see what a happy union they have formed there; see how they have all things common, and how "they love one another fervently." Oh let us have such a blessed union here! To be sure, and why not? And this blessed union would have been forced on by a brute majority in Scotland, as it was in Canada, had it not been for two things: first, that the Parliament there was too honest, and had too much regard for the sacred rights of others to sanction anything in the shape of robbery and plunder; and next, that the minority, a small, but determined one, met, and virtually said to "the go a-heads," every minister that joins that union shall be ousted from his church and from his Manse, and shall be declared no longer a minister of this church." This had the desired effect, for the majority knew that the minority had the power to execute their threat, and, therefore, they quietly settled down to behave themselves, and the union is not made yet. Should it be asked why the minority had such a power? It is answered that every free church, build since 1843, had title deeds to the effect that "This church shall be in connection with the free church of Scotland in all time coming;" this being the case, any single member could have claimed the church in case of any unprincipled union. This shows that they can do things better in the old country than here. So that the union here was not so much intended for the benefit of the people as for a blow at the old Kirk. And we have heard the remark often made that many of the churches in the landward districts do not raise nearly so much money for religious purposes since the union

deal out a double blow to the Church of Scotland; first, by their own desertion from her to weaken her hands, and next by running off with her cash-box to cripple her.

The next want in which their security lies in Scotland is this: that there are no vulgar voting shops about their Parliament halls, no unprincipled M. P's. who trample in the dust the first principle of common honesty, and no rude fellows, of the baser sort, to bawl out, "Vote, vote" away the endowments of *one* church to enrich *another*. No; they must act more honestly in the old country than do these things.

This shows that different sects may all hold one, and the same *doctrine*, and that yet it would be the basest tyranny for State power to compel them to unite under heavy penalties in case of refusal. The State has no right to force anyone to worship this way or that,

as before; that they rest upon their oars, and trust to the large and wealthy congregations in the Union to supply their deficits; that instead of paying their ministers as formerly, they offer a mere moiety of the amount, and apply to the Home Mission fund, alias the Temporalities Board to complete the required sum and this encourages a spirit of selfishness. But the ardent Unionist will point you to a new mission station here, and a new mission station there, and a new church yonder, and say: "See what we have done, look how we are prospering, and what a 'splendid success' we have made!" But we say it was not the Union that produced these effects, but the \$70,000 dishonestly filched from the Temporalities Fund, that the same effects could have been accomplished *without* the Union if the parties had had the same control over the cash-box. So that the good done has been of an unnatural growth, and of a spasmodic nature. And when the Temporalities Fund is all exhausted, which it would soon be in its present reckless hands, the Union Church will be in a worse plight than ever.

The next statement of the Very Rev. Corypheus is this: "If Parliament laid down the precedent they were asked to do in this case, he held that the *smallest* minority protesting against any union of their Church to another could claim all the property previously belonging to their church." This is quite true, perhaps the most true and logical statement in the whole speech.

It was held good in law in Scotland after the great Secession in 1843, with respect to the Quoad Sacra Churches. These churches were erected to be connected with the Church of Scotland in all time coming, and they could not break the title deeds. The Free Church claimed them, and the Church of Scotland claimed them and they went to law, and it was decided in the House of Lords that the Free Church had no claim; and this decision was given on the strength of the title deeds. Their Lordships found that they could not violate the law even to satisfy a clamorous majority. Corypheus's great mistake lies in his dishonest majorityism. Whenever he sees that he cannot gain an end legally and honestly he tries on beastly voting. He either wants the common sense to see, or the common honesty to acknowledge that majorities have got nothing to do with the rights of cash and property; that no majority can vote away the dollars in his pocket to give them to a thief. The rights of the *few* are just as sacred in the eyes of the law as the rights of the many, and if church property cannot be taken from the many, so neither can it be taken from the few. There is no hardship here, for the minority do not forcibly expel the majority, and if they leave of their own accord,

and for their own benefit, it is but right that they should leave at their own expense, that is, leave every thing behind them. If property were at the mercy of majorities. it would be a sorry lookout ; no man could call his own, his own. In this whole business we think that Corypheus has manifested very condemnable moral principles.

We have now said our say, and we add in closing, that our statements by no means form an exhaustive criticism upon the Principal's Ottawa speech ; far from it. But we have touched upon a point here and there, and think that we have said enough to demolish the two principles with which he set out, and without which, he acknowledged that the United Church had no case. And we are convinced that it has no case, not even a stump to stand upon. The minority must take this case once more to the Privy Council, not for the sake of the money alone, but for the sake of the principle of religious liberty involved in it.

SPECTATOR.

